

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, the Applicants submit the below remarks and respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-68 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable by “VolanoChat Java solution turns ordinary web sites into interactive money makers”, Business Wire, pp. 1-2 (hereinafter Volano) in view of U.S. Patent 5,572,619 (hereinafter Judson) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,862,330 (hereinafter Anupam). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons set out below.

Applicants contend that references individually or in combination do not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1, or the other independent claims of the present application. The Applicants’ arguments shall be presented with respect to claim 1. However, these comments are applicable to the other independent claims of the present application, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these comments and remarks when reviewing the other independent claims for allowability.

Neither Volano nor Judson teach or suggest wherein chat functions of the chat region and browser functions of the browser region are synchronized via dynamic linking of chat applications and browser applications, as claimed in the present invention. Although the Office Action acknowledges this, it states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Volano and Judson with the teachings of Anupam to arrive at the present invention, as claimed. However, Anupam does not teach or suggest the shortcomings of Volano and Judson.

Anupam discloses technique for obtaining and exchanging information on world wide web. The technique involves employing a computer surrogate to ensure that everyone involved in collaborative browsing session views a URL that is selected by a leader of the session. Anupam states in Column 2, lines 33-35 that “the collaborators may

interact with one another through text-chat communications ... ”. However, Anupam does not state or suggest that the text-chat communications are synchronized with the web browsing activities of the collaborators. Anupam mentions text-chatting in Column 4, lines 32-36, wherein Anupam states that “the collaborators may point and click at a specified icon to make the text-chat connections for exchanging their opinions on automobiles as the HTML documents unfold before them.” However, again Anupam does not state or suggest that the chat sessions are synchronized with the browser actions of the users. Anupam simply discloses that the collaborators are presented with an ability to establish chatting connections with other collaborators in parallel, this does not teach or suggest that the chatting sessions are synchronized with the browser actions via a dynamic linking of chat communications and browser activities. For Examiner’s convenience the Applicants draw Examiner’s attention to the specification of the present application, page 11, lines 13-24, wherein an example of synchronized chat and browse functions of the present invention is described.

Furthermore, the Applicants submit that the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are based on Examiner’s knowledge improperly gleaned from the Applicants’ disclosure. As stated above, Anupam does not teach or suggest, in any form, that the chat sessions and the browser activities are synchronized via dynamic linking. Thus, it is unclear to the Applicants, how disclosure of capability of establishing chatting communications, as disclosed in Anupam, teaches or suggests to one skilled in the art without knowledge of the present invention to synchronize the browser activities with the chat communications via dynamic linking.

The Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) has been addressed, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. The Applicants furthermore submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Dated: June 4, 2003

Saina S. Shamilov
Reg. No. 48,266

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720 - 8300